

Am.
India

Friends of Freedom for India

0991

AMERICA ON BRITISH RULE IN INDIA

By

Andrew Carnegie

Mark Twain

Bishop Henry Potter

Jenkin Lloyd Jones

Paul. S. Reinsch

William Jennings Bryan

William T. Harris

Theodore Roosevelt

And Others

FRIENDS OF FREEDOM FOR INDIA
PRICE 25 CENTS
Room 601, 7 EAST 15th STREET
NEW YORK CITY

NEW YORK
WOLFE TONE CO.
PUBLISHERS

AMERICA ON BRITISH RULE IN INDIA

By

Andrew Carnegie

Mark Twain

Bishop Henry Potter

Jenkin Lloyd Jones

Paul. S. Reinsch

William Jennings Bryan

William T. Harris

Theodore Roosevelt

And Others

PRICE 25 CENTS

NEW YORK
WOLFE TONE CO.
PUBLISHERS

But even India is beginning to see the light, and one of these days the strong barriers of caste will be swept aside as the brown men of the hills and the brown men of the plains fight shoulder to shoulder to drive the British from their land and come again into their own.

Mr. Roosevelt must know these things, and with his deep and clear insight into American sympathies he knows that *the heart of America will be with the Hindu when he strikes for freedom.*—Jan. 20, 1909.

Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, the United States Senator from Wisconsin:

One hundred million dollars spent for glitter! Two million fleshless bodies dead of starvation. One hundred million dollars paid for dazzling pageants. Two hundred million hungry people. The one hundred million dollars represent the cost of India's great durbar. The two million bodies are those of famine-stricken Hindus. The two hundred million people are those subjects of the King of England and Emperor of India who go to sleep every night hungry. Think how far one hundred million dollars would go toward filling those empty stomachs. And *think what could be done to keep these empty stomachs filled, with the money that is taken every year by India's absolute rulers for pomp, pride and pageantry.* There you have the problem in India. Not

all of it: but the heart of it. High cost of living breeds discontent. Poverty spells unrest. Empty stomachs cry out revolution. India is disturbed. Her people yearn for prosperity, for what we have heard called "*the full dinner pail*." They—undoubtedly a majority of them—look upon English rule as a government of exploitation. So they are demanding education, home industries and self-government.—La Follette's Weekly, Dec. 30, 1911.

Dr. PAUL S. REINSCH, the present United States Minister to China, formerly head of the Department of Political Science in the University of Wisconsin:

It would be misleading to attribute the present "unrest" in India to a superficial stirring up of the people by irresponsible agitators. On the contrary, the whole impact of the strain of the attempted adjustment between the old and the new, the East and the West, has now become concentrated upon political relations, and all the latent disaffection of a vast society, poor and dependent, is seeking a vent in political agitation. No police action, no methods of repression, can solve this difficulty.

The present situation in India illustrates some of the unfortunate results of the political dependence of a civilized people. Not only politically, but also in eco-

conomic matters, India is kept in a state of dependence on the metropole. But the most hopeless feature of the situation is that the men who would naturally be leaders in government and enterprise, find themselves excluded from opportunities for exercising legitimate power in their own country. Such a decapitation of an entire people is a great sacrifice to impose, even in return for the blessings of peace and an efficient policing of the country. *The continuance of this policy would mean either the total destruction and degradation of Indian national life, or the end of the British Raj.*—Intellectual and Political Currents in the Far East. Pages 105 and 114-115.

Bishop HENRY C. POTTER of New York:

Remonstrance against the injustice of existing laws and resistance to their operation need not beget hatred of British rule or even an impatience of British authorities. It is a tragic situation—that of India to-day—but the moment one has said this, one is bound to remember there are Britons who feel this as keenly as you or I. It would be easy, by sweeping criticism, fierce accusation and the like, to provoke where we might persuade—even Americans will have to learn a brotherly note which not all of them I met in my travels in India were wont to sound. India has truly suffered much from the commercial spirit of Great Britain, and from a disposition

on the part of the British traders to utilize East Indian conditions for the exclusive enrichment of Great Britain's manufacturers and traders. *It seems to me the wise line for East Indians to take is to insist upon their right to buy and sell of and to such dealers and in such a way as shall best serve their own domestic interests, and protest against any British legislation which invades the freedom of Oriental purchasers of whatever goods, wherever made, as an essential violation of the eternal equity.*—From a letter to Myron H. Phelps, published in "The Public," November 20, 1908.

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN:

The more I read about the British rule in India, the more unjust it seems. . . . The trouble is that England acquired India for England's advantage, not for India's, and that she holds India for England's benefit, not for India's. *She administers India with an eye to England's interests, not India's, and she passes judgment upon every question as a judge would were he permitted to decide his own case. . . .*

The government of India is as arbitrary and despotic as the government of Russia ever was and in two respects it is worse. First, it is administered by an alien people, whereas the officials of Russia are Russians. Secondly, it drains a large part of the taxes out of the

country, whereas the Russian government spends at home the money it collects from the people.

A third disadvantage might be named, since the Czar has already created a legislative body, whereas England continues to deny the Indians any form of representative or constitutional government. The people of India are taxed, but they have no voice in the amount to be collected or in the use to be made of the revenue. They pay into the government nearly \$225,000,000 a year, and of this nearly \$100,000,000 is expended upon an army in which Indians cannot be officers.

It is not necessary to keep such an army merely to hold the people in subjection. If the Indians are really satisfied with English rule, and if the army is intended to keep Russia from taking India, as is sometimes claimed, why should not the British government bear a part of the burden? Would it not be wiser so to attach the Indian people to the British government that they would themselves resist annexation to Russia?

The home charges, as they are called, absorb practically one-third of the entire revenues. About \$100,000,000 goes out of India to England every year; more than \$15,000,000 is paid to the British officials in the civil employ. What nation could stand such a drain without impoverishment? Taxation is nearly twice as heavy in India as in England in proportion to the income of the people.

To say that the Indians would necessarily fight among themselves is to ignore the progress of the world. There was a time when Europe was the scene of bloody religious wars, and our country is indebted to the persecution of the Pilgrims in England for some of its best pioneers. There has been a growth in religious tolerance during the last century, and this is as noticeable in India as elsewhere. Already the intellectual leaders of all sects and elements of the Indian population are mingling in congress, conferences and public meetings. Already a national spirit is growing which like the national spirit in England and America disregards religious lines and emphasizes more and more the broad social need which are common to all; and with the increase of general education, there will be still more unity and national sentiment. . . .

Let no one cite India as an argument in defence of colonialism. On the Ganges and the Indus the Briton, in spite of his many noble qualities and his large contribution to the world's advancement, has demonstrated, as many have before, man's inability to exercise, with wisdom and justice, irresponsible power over helpless people. He has conferred some benefits upon India, but *he has extorted a tremendous price for them. While he has boasted of bringing peace to the living he has led millions to the peace of the grave; while he has dwelt upon order established between warring troops he has impoverished the country by legalized pillage. Pillage*

is a strong word, but no refinement of language can purge the present system of its iniquity.

Dr. CHARLES CUTHBERT HALL, late President of the Union Theological Seminary of New York, and Burrow's Lecturer on the Orient:

Agitation in America, the reforming of the public opinion as to the exact facts, will do more than anything else to bring England to her senses. For *there is no denying the fact that England is administering India for England's benefit and not India's*. It is hard for me to say this, because until I went to India my sympathies were all on the English side. My early education was much in England and I have many dear personal friends there. But what I am saying now is the truth, and the truth must be told. . . .

Not long ago Mr. Morley made a speech in which he said he hoped he would not be blamed for the Indian famine; he did not suppose even Indians will demand of the Secretary of State that he play the part of Elijah on Mount Carmel, intimating that the only difficulty is the failure of the rains. But this is not true, and it seems incredible that any intelligent, adequately informed man could so misunderstand the situation. There are factors in this terrible question which I would not care to discuss even in this room. *The obvious fact stares us in the face that there is at no time, in no year, any shortage of food-*

stuffs in India. The trouble is that the *Taxes* imposed by the British government *being fifty per cent. of produce, the Indian starves that England's annual revenue may not be diminished by a dollar.* Eighty per cent. of the whole population has been thrown back upon the soil because *England's discriminating duties have ruined practically every branch of native manufacture;* and these tillers of the soil, when they have sold themselves for the last time to the money lender, when they have over and over again mortgaged their crops and their bit of land, are sold by the tax-collector to wander about until they drop of starvation. . . . We send ship-loads of grain to India, but there is plenty of grain in India. The trouble is the people have been ground down until they are too poor to buy it. Famine is chronic there now, though the same shipments of foodstuffs are made annually to England, the same drainage of millions of dollars goes on every year. . . .

The present initiative of the Indian people themselves is the thing we should seek to nourish. In this present generation there has sprung up the *swadeshi movement*, like the Irish Sinn Fein, like our Colonial boycott; *young men are sacrificing everything to get industrial education and revive the ruined industries of their country.* And this is where we Americans can help without in the least encroaching on the rights of our sister nation.—From a speech in the Bar Association Club House, New York, quoted in "The Public," November 20, 1908.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, at the time of speaking
he was President of U. S. A.:

The successful administration of the Indian Empire by the English has been one of the most admirable achievements of the European race during the last two centuries. . . . *It has been for the immeasurable benefit of the natives of India themselves.* The mass of the people have been and are far better off than ever before, and far better than they would be now if English control were overthrown or withdrawn. *England does not draw a penny from India for English purposes.* . . .—From a speech delivered in the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C.

Open letter to Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States of America. By Jenkin Lloyd Jones of Chicago, Prof. Charles R. Lanman of Harvard, Dr. Charles F. Aked, Moorfield Storey of Boston, Luis F. Post of Washington, William Lloyd Garrison of New York, Myron H. Phelps of New York and other prominent and representative Americans.

Not only are the Indian people allowed no part in shaping the destiny of their own country, but even freedom of speech and of assembly are permitted only under the severest limitations and the most galling espionage, and freedom of the press has been taken away. To-day nearly one hundred (hundreds have been added since) editors and other men of influence in Indian public life are serving terms of from one to ten years (some for life) in prison, many of them *without trial*, and in not

a few cases without *even having been informed of the nature of their offence*. Recently, within a single week, nine prominent men have been secretly arrested and deported without charge or trial. In nearly every instance where men have been informed of their crime, it is "*sedition.*" *In India if one so much as points out the wrongs which the people suffer, or agitates for redress, that is "sedition."* There is no Indian home that is not liable at any hour of the day or night to be forcibly entered at the instigation of spying police. There is no Indian gentleman, however high his position or unimpeachable his character, who is not liable at any moment to be arrested and hurried away to an unknown prison. . . . Is this method of governing a people one which the President of a Republic should praise? . . .

You assert, Mr. President, that England does not draw a penny from India for English purposes, but spends all Indian revenue in India for the benefit of the people of India. In answer to this assertion we beg to submit the following facts:

Englishmen went to India in the beginning not for benevolent purposes but because India was a country of great wealth, having an almost world-wide trade from which they hoped to reap large financial returns. This was three hundred years ago. . . . From the first appearance of England in India a stream of wealth began to flow to London. Closely following military conquest the stream soon vastly increased and has continued to

the present day with steady growing volume, to the enormous enrichment of England and the corresponding impoverishment of the Indian people.

The great industrial prosperity of Britain, beginning about the middle of the eighteenth century, unparalleled in any other European country, owed its origin to the sudden and enormous influx of wealth from India. Mr. Brooks Adams says (Law of Civilization and Decay. Pages 259-264): "Very soon after the battle of Plassey in 1757, the Bengal plunder began to arrive in London, and the effect appears to have been almost instantaneous. . . . Probably since the world began no investment has ever yielded the profit reaped from the Indian plunder." The amount of treasure wrung from the conquered people and transferred from India to English banks between Plassey and Waterloo (57 years) has been variously estimated at from \$2,500,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000. The methods of "plunder" and embezzlement by which nearly every Briton in India enriched himself during the earlier history of the East India Company gradually passed away. But the drain did not pass away, or grew less severe or less impoverishing to the Indian people. The difference between that earlier day and the present is, that India's tribute to England is obtained by indirect methods and under forms of "*law*"—law, it should be observed, however, which England herself has framed to enable her to accomplish her end of keeping Indian interests steadily subordinate to her own.

The exact amount of this *drain at the present time* is difficult to ascertain, but it is considerably *more than* \$100,000,000 *a year*. Most authorities put the sum at between \$125,000,000 and \$150,000,000 *a year*. It approximates (though it exceeds) the trade balance against India, which for the past forty years has averaged over \$100,000,000 *a year* or an aggregate for that period of more than \$4,000,000,000. This measures approximately the amount of India's tribute to England during these four decades alone. *What must have been the whole drain—her whole tribute during the past 300 years?*

Mr. President, will you have the goodness to take these facts and figures and place them beside your astonishing statement that England does not draw a penny from India for English purposes?—February 26, 1909.

THE ORIGIN OF TAMMANY

By Mark Twain

Great Britain had a Tammany and a Croker a good while ago. This Tammany was in India and it began its career with the spread of the English dominion after the battle of Plassey. *Its first boss was Clive, a sufficiently crooked person sometimes, but straight as a yardstick when compared with the corkscrew crookedness of the second boss, Warren Hastings.*

The old-time Tammany was the East India Com-

pany's government, and had its headquarters at Calcutta. Ostensively it consisted of a Great Council of four persons, of whom one was the Governor-General Warren Hastings. Really it consisted of one person—Warren Hastings: for by usurpation he concentrated all authority in himself and governed the country like an autocrat.

Ostensively the Court of Directors, sitting in London and representing the vast interests of the stockholders, was supreme in authority over the Calcutta Great Council, whose membership it appointed and removed at pleasure, whose policies it dictated, and to whom it conveyed its will in the form of sovereign commands; but whenever it suited Hastings, he ignored even that august body's authority and conducted the mighty affairs of the British Empire in India to suit his own notions.

At his mercy was the daily bread of every official, every trader, every clerk, every civil servant, big and little, in the whole huge India Company's machine, and the man who hazarded his bread by failure of subserviency to the boss lost it.

Now then, let the supreme masters of British India, the giant corporation of the India Company of London, stand for the voters of the City of New York, but the Great Council of Calcutta stand for Tammany. . . . Let Warren Hastings stand for Richard Croker, and it seems to me that the parallel is exact and complete. And so let us be properly grateful and thank God and our good

luck that we did not invent Tammany.—From a speech delivered in New York, October 7, 1901.

WILLIAM J. GAYNOR, the late Mayor of New York City:

The constant aggression of the West upon the peaceful and unwarlike East, instigated by commercial enterprise if not commercial greed, has been invariably in the name of Christianity. We have taken possession of their choicest provinces and their best ports. And now in the progress of time we call for universal peace. Whether it is within God's Providence that the long-gathering resentment engendered by Europe's trespasses on the Eastern Nations, India in particular, can be allayed without war, unless amends and restitutions be first made, is a matter of sober thought.—From a speech reported in the New York "Herald."

THE PLUNDER FROM INDIA

By Brooks Adams

In discussing the phenomena of the highly centralized society, in which he lived, Mill defined capital "as the accumulated stock of human labor." In other words, capital may be considered as stored energy; but

most of this energy flows in fixed channels; money alone is capable of being transmuted immediately into any form of activity. Therefore the influx of the Indian treasure, by adding considerably to the nation's cash capital, not only increased its stock of energy but added much to its flexibility and the rapidity of its movement.

Very soon after the battle of Plassey (1757) the Bengal plunder began to arrive at London, and the effect appears to have been instantaneous, for all authorities agree that the "industrial revolution," which has divided the nineteenth century from all antecedent time, began with the year 1760. Prior to 1760, according to Baines, the machinery used for spinning cotton in Lancashire was almost as simple as in India; while about 1750 the English iron industry was in full decline because of the destruction of the forests for fuel. At that time four-fifths of the iron used in the kingdom came from Sweden.

Plassey was fought in 1757, and probably nothing has ever equalled the rapidity of the change which followed. In 1760 the flying-shuttle appeared and coal began to replace wood in smelting. In 1764 Hargreaves invented the spinning-jenny, in 1779 Crompton contrived the mule, in 1785 Cartwright patented the powerloom, and, chief of all, in 1768 Watt matured the steam engine, the most perfect of all vents of centralizing energy. But though these machines served as outlets for the accelerating movement of the time, they did not cause that acceleration. In themselves inventions are

passive, many of them most important, having lain dormant for centuries, waiting for a sufficient store of force to have accumulated to set them working. *That store must always take the shape of money*, and money not hoarded, but in motion. The least part of Watt's labor lay in conceiving his idea; he consumed his life marketing it. Before the influx of the Indian treasure, and the expansion of credit, which followed, no force sufficient for this purpose existed; and had Watt lived fifty years earlier, he and his invention must have perished together. . . .

Possibly since the world began no investment has ever yielded the profit reaped from the Indian plunder, because for nearly fifty years Great Britain stood without a competitor. That she should have so long enjoyed a monopoly seems at first mysterious, but perhaps the condition of the continent may suggest an explanation. Since Italy had been ruined by the loss of the Eastern trade, she had ceased to breed the economic mind; consequently no class of her population could suddenly and violently accelerate their movements. In Spain the priest and soldier had so thoroughly exterminated the sceptic that far from centralizing during the seventeenth century, as England and France had done, her empire was in full decline at the revolution of 1688. In France something similar had happened, though in a much less degree. After a struggle of a century and half, the Church so far prevailed in 1685 as to secure the revoca-

tion of the edict of Nantes. At the revocation many Huguenots went into exile and thus no small proportion of the economic class, who should have pressed England hardest, were driven across the Channel to add their energy to the energy of the natives. Germany lacked capital. Hemmed in by enemies, and without a sea-coast, she had been at a disadvantage in predatory warfare; accordingly she did not accumulate money and failed to consolidate until in 1870 she extorted from France. Thus in 1760 Holland alone remained as a competitor, rich, maritime and peopled by Protestants. But Holland lacked the mass possessed by the great antagonist, besides being without minerals; and, accordingly, far from accelerating her progress, she proved unable to maintain her relative rate of advance. Thus isolated and favored by mines of coal and iron, England not only commanded the European and American markets, at a time when production was strained to the utmost by war, but even undersold Hindoo labor at Calcutta. In some perfect way her gains may be estimated by the growth of her debt, which must represent savings. In 1756, when Clive went to India, the nation owed £74,475,000, of which it paid an interest of £2,753,000. In 1815 this debt had swelled to £861,000,000, with an annual interest charge of £32,645,000. In 1761 the Duke of Bridgewater finished the first of the canals which were afterwards to form an inland waterway, costing £50,000,000, or more than two-thirds of the amount of the public debt at the outbreak of the

Seven Years' War. Meanwhile also steam had been introduced, factories built, turnpikes improved, and bridges erected and all this had been done through a system of credit extending throughout the land. *Credit is the chosen vehicle of energy in centralized societies and no sooner had treasure enough accumulated in London from the plunderers of India to offer it a foundation, then it shot up with marvellous rapidity.*—The Law of Civilization and Decay. Pages 259-260.

ENGLAND'S EDUCATIONAL POLICY IN INDIA

By Dr. William T. Harris,

former United States Commissioner of Education; Editor of the Webster's International Dictionary

England's educational policy in India is a blight on civilization. I have studied the problem pretty closely. In the latter part of the eighteenth century Wilberforce, the English philanthropist, proposed to send school teachers to India, but a Director of the East India Company objected, saying: "We have just lost America from our folly in having allowed the establishment of schools and colleges, and it would not do for us to repeat the same act of folly in regard to India."

There are no free public schools in India and no compulsory system of primary education. *Young Indians are hungry for education; and it is our duty to do*

whatever we can to help the spread of education in that great country of ancient culture and wonderful philosophy.

England is like a huge crocodile, and it opens its mouth wide and crushes everything that comes between its jaws.—From a speech before the National Council of Education, during its session in Cleveland, 1908.

THE CAUSES OF FAMINE IN INDIA

By Rev. J. T. Sunderland

Perhaps there is nothing so dangerous, or so evil in its effect, as irresponsible power. That is what Great Britain exercises in connection with India—absolute power, with no one to call her to account. . . . Every free nation safeguards alike its people and its rulers by making its rulers in everything answerable. Here is the anomaly of the British rule in India. Britain through her Indian government rules India, but she does not acknowledge responsibility in any degree whatever to the Indian people.

All candid and thorough investigation into the causes of the famine of India has shown that the chief and fundamental cause has been and is the exercise of the irresponsible power. . . . One cause of India's impoverishment is heavy taxation. Taxation in England and Scotland is high, so high that Englishmen and

Scotchmen complain bitterly. *But the people of India are taxed more than twice as heavily as the people of England, and three times more heavily than those of Scotland. . . . Think of taxing the American people to the extent of one-third of their total income? . . .* Notice the single item of salt-taxation. Salt is an absolute necessity of the people, to the very poorest; they must have it or die. But the tax upon it, which for many years they have been compelled to pay, has been much greater than the cost value of the salt. Under this taxation the quantity of salt consumed has been reduced actually to one-half the quantity declared by medical authorities to be absolutely necessary for health. . . . With such facts as these before us, we do not wonder at Herbert Spencer's indignant protest against the "grievous salt-monopoly" of the Indian government, and "the pitiless taxation which wrings from the poor ryots nearly half the products of the soil." . . .

It is said that India is incapable of ruling herself. If so, what an indictment is this against England? *She was not incapable of ruling herself before England came.* Have one hundred and forty years of English tutelage produced in her such deterioration? *As we have seen, she was possessed of a high civilization and of developed governments long before England or any part of Europe had emerged from barbarism. For three thousand years before England's arrival, Indian Kingdoms and Empires had held leading places in Asia. Some of the ablest rulers, statesmen and financiers of the world have been of*

India's production. How is it, then, that she loses her ability to govern herself as soon as England appears upon the scene? To be sure, at that time she was in a peculiarly disorganized and unsettled state; for it should be remembered that the Mogul Empire was just breaking up, and new political adjustments were everywhere just being made—a fact which accounts for England's being able to gain a political foothold in India. But everything indicates that if *India had not been interfered with by European powers, she would soon have been under competent governments of her own again.*—The “Atlantic Monthly,” October, 1908.

NEW INDIA

By Andrew Carnegie

I traveled through India and was introduced to educated natives by American officials, who, without exception, were upon terms of closest intimacy with the people. To the Briton, his master, the Indian is naturally reserved; *to the American he is drawn by sympathetic bonds.* Conversation was quite free and unrestrained, and the writer believes that he thus obtained an insight into the situation in India which few Britons can secure. That there is a strong and growing desire on the part of educational Indians ultimately to govern their own country goes without saying. *They would not be educated if this aspiration did not arise within them.* Edu-

cation makes rebels against invaders. *Material benefits conferred by them, however great, count for little against the spirit of national independence.* . . . The young Indians are educated in British colleges and schools, and read British history. They know the long and glorious struggle of the people against absolute monarchs. Their heroes are the heroes of our English-speaking race. *They have the story of Washington and the American Revolution.* . . . British history cannot be read and understood without inspiring within the reader under military control an invincible resolve to free and govern his own country.

Following Indian affairs with interest, the writer judges that within recent years this sentiment has grown rapidly and is continually strengthening. The native press proves it. Let there then be no delusion about the Indian problem. The aim of the educated there to-day is to govern their own country, and this sentiment must soon permeate the others. . . . However, if India be properly guided, no violent revolution need be feared. The movement towards Independence would be orderly and slow, although *irresistible.* . . . *Proclaim coercion and the part of America would soon be played by them over again.* . . .

If all were known, it is not Russia or any foreign attack that the military officials dread. It is *the growing home-rule sentiment they consider dangerous to British control.* It is against the people of India, not against the

foreigner, that the legions are to be moved. It would be a fatal mistake for Britain to ignore the truth that intelligent natives take keenly to heart and brood over the fact that no native regiment is entrusted with the artillery. The people of India fully recognize the significance of this. It invites serious thought as revealing mistrust. As long as it exists it will tell the story of foreign subjection, military occupation, a just conqueror, yet a conqueror and all that this implies. There is no Russian wolf or any other that can find a desirable prey there, or which could capture it from the Indian people if there were. The British army needs no strengthening to meet the imaginary Russian danger, neither to meet the danger of intensified native dissatisfaction, for the sure and only effective cure for that is to begin at once an enlargement of native participation in the government, holding out the promise that Britain is teaching them to become self-governing in due time. The problem is internal, not external. *It is within, not without, India that the wolf lurks.*—The "Nineteenth Century and After," August, 1906.

ENGLAND IS HER OWN ENEMY

By Paul Kennedy

The Englishman is England's greatest enemy in India. By his arrogance and selfishness, by his lack of sympathy and understanding, he has spread wide through

three hundred million Indian subjects of the British crown discontent, disloyalty and hatred. . . . On all sides I met the same complaint, the power of the police, their unblushing extortion of perjured confession, the reliance the officials place in them. Among others who confirmed this was one almost unique in India—an Englishman writing and talking for reform in India. He had his bungalow searched without warrant of law. "I kicked the fellow out and wrote a stiff letter to the governor and received an apology in return," he said, "but if they will dare to come into an Englishman's house, what do you think they will do with an Indian?" . . .

Indians do not understand and do not like the huge central bureaucracy which has been reared in the place of their *ancient self-governing villages, and they hate and fear these all-powerful scheming police representatives of the new order. The Indian people have been forcibly disarmed, and a whole race has been shut out from positions of real trust and responsibility. They feel they are powerless, that they have no longer voice in their own affairs, that they are a beaten people ruled by their conquerors. . . .*

Again and again I have heard the statement that *there is little religious difference between the people except for that instigated by the unscrupulous police and the lower officials, "who are capable of going to any length." Mohammedans and Hindus have been living together in concord for generations in the villages of India.*

They have been friendly neighbors, helping each other to maintain a precarious existence in this world, each willing to let the other find his way to the world to come as best he may. . . .

In the meantime a more active party has risen—the extremist section of the Nationalists, *Indians who advocate “driving out the British Raj” and “India for the Indians” at once by fair means or foul.* They are casting bombs with the usual enthusiasm and the usual haphazard aim that men with bombs display. *Pax Britannica, trade and flag and all they mean to put an end to. Youths they are, many of them filled with holy zeal, a burning sense of shame and a determination to avenge and right the wrongs of their long-suffering motherland. Such as pay with their lives for political assassinations are looked upon as martyrs. Men, women and children in Calcutta still go barefooted in sign of mourning on the anniversary of the execution of one of them. Call it fanaticism, call it cowardice, call it what you will, but the fact remains that the new phase of the fight for liberty in India is widespread and is spreading wider.*—“The Forum,” February, 1910.

ENGLAND’S SWORD OF BLOOD

By William Randolph Hearst

Since when has it become necessary to urge England to govern with a rod of iron and a sword of blood?

Did she ever fail through excessive gentleness in India, in Ireland, in South Africa, in Egypt or in America? *India, Ireland, Egypt and South Africa are broken with a rod of iron, and their soil is wet from the sword of blood.*

America alone successfully resisted and yet a representative of the United States of America dares to rise in an English assemblage and advocate more of force in England's governmental methods. . . .

India, which has been for centuries held by England with one mailed hand and plundered with the other, does not complain of any lack of force in England's methods. Roosevelt prates like Kipling of the white man's burden and of the higher duty of civilization—well-worn words often used to conceal the seams of selfish purpose and the scars of brutal methods. What is the burden of the conquerors compared with the burden of the conquered? What is there of higher civilization and nobler ambition in governing subject peoples against their will and against their interests? . . .

In these days, when the whole world is waking up to the "sentimental" and practical advantages of government by the people in their own interests, this self-appointed representative of our Republican government is advocating an increased imperialism and advising force and popular repression. . . . Why should Mr. Roosevelt, if he is the representative of America, so far depart from Washington's injunction and America's estab-

lished custom as to meddle in foreign affairs in which he is not concerned? *Why should he, in the first place, advise English people in their own business, and in the second place, why should he urge them to further force and repression and advocate un-American imperialism?*

Why should he deny the accepted American idea of *the right of self-government and contradict the statement of our Declaration of Independence, that a just government is based upon the consent of the governed?*

If Roosevelt is right, then Washington was wrong and Jefferson was wrong. If Roosevelt is right, then our Revolutionary War was a mistake, the Boston Tea Party a treasonable act, and Lexington and Bunker Hill murderous violence of revolutionists.

If Roosevelt's speech expresses Americanism, then Patrick Henry's patriotic words should be torn from the First Readers of young Americans and Roosevelt's truckling twaddle substituted. Let our sons no longer be taught to declaim, "Give us liberty or give us death," but let them be taught to plead for imperialism and oppression. *If Patrick Henry's speech was treason to the throne, then Roosevelt's speech is treason to the Republic.*—The New York "Evening Journal," June 2, 1910.

